



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/599,203 | 09/22/2006 | Yoshinobu Yamazaki | Q96974 | 5777 |
| 23373 | 7590 | 02/25/2011 | EXAMINER | |
| SUGHRUE MION, PLLC | | | PAGONAKIS, ANNA | |
| 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. | | | | |
| SUITE 800 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20037 | | | 1628 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/25/2011 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/599,203 | YAMAZAKI ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | ANNA PAGONAKIS | 1628 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 11, 12 and 17.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-10, 15, 16 and 18.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Brandon J Fetterolf/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1628

/Anna Pagonakis/
Examiner, Art Unit 1628

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's remarks presented in the after-final arguments regarding the 103 obviousness rejection has been considered and entered into the record but is not found persuasive.

Applicant alleges that the unexpected results obtained by the presently claimed invention rebut any prima facie case of obviousness. It should be noted that Applicant has not reviewed any unexpected results in the instant response. Applicant alleges that the composition and method of Garvey are different from the claimed invention. Applicant is reminded that Garvey et al. teaches a method for the treatment of an overactive bladder with the administration of an alpha-adrenergic receptor antagonist such as KMD-3213. Applicant is again reminded that rejections made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are based upon the combination of references. As a result, focusing solely on the discrete teachings of each of the cited references is tantamount to examining each of them inside of a vacuum and fails to be persuasive in establishing non-obviousness because it is the combined teachings that are the basis for a proper conclusion of obviousness, not each individual reference alone. In other words, it must be remembered that the references are relied upon in combination and are not meant to be considered separately. To properly conclude obviousness of an invention does not require the claimed invention to be expressly suggested in its entirety by any one single reference under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Rather, the test is what the combined references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant alleges that Garvey et al. teaches many potential combination of agents. Applicant appears to be of the persuasion that, because Garvey et al. discloses compounds in addition to the one instantly claimed, this somehow constitutes a complete lack of teaching of the claimed compound and/or constitutes a teaching away from the instantly claimed compound. This is not found persuasive. A preferred or exemplified embodiment disclosed within the four corners of the reference, including non-preferred embodiments. Applicant is reminded that the disclosure of a reference must be considered as expansively as is reasonably possible to determine the full scope of the disclosure and, as a result, is most certainly not limited to that which is preferred or exemplified. Thus, the fact that other compounds may be exemplified, claimed and/or preferred does not negate or direct the artisan away from the broader teaching of the reference, which expressly provides for, and thus, clearly contemplates the use of instantly claimed compound.

Applicant alleges that urinary incontinence and overactive bladder are not the same. This is not found persuasive. Guittard et al. clearly teaches that involuntary urinary incontinence is also known as urge incontinence and overactive bladder (column 1, lines 55-56). Applicant has not presented any evidence to the contrary.

The rejection is maintained for the reasons set forth supra and those previously made of record.